

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 were pending in this application. Claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-11 will remain pending herein upon entry of this Amendment. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found, for example, at page 8, last paragraph and page 14, third paragraph of the present application. For at least the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action mailed, claims 1-5 and 10-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aggarwal in view of He and Ogle. To the extent this rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, it is respectfully traversed.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner, as stated at the bottom of page 3 of the present Office Action, that Aggarwal fails to teach at least sending the messages to the found message-routing-in-charge host, wherein the message-routing-in-charge host is regarded as another sending host and ending the steps of dynamic routing when a message is successfully transported. Applicant disagrees, however, that Ogle supplies the deficiencies sufficient to support a rejection of claim 1 as unpatentable over Aggarwal in view of Ogle.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Ogle does not teach step g, "sending the messages to the found message-routing-in-charge host via at least one of said series of routers, wherein the message-routing-in-charge host is regarded as another sending host." It is clear based upon the description in the background of the Ogle reference that destination work station 30 is not

Serial No.: 09/759,343
Art Unit: 2662

Attorney's Docket No.: ACR0009-US
Page 8

regarded as another sending host as is apparently asserted by the Examiner. What Ogle discloses is, as the Examiner states, a typical routing where the sending host 28 sends a message to destination host 30 via router 20, network 18, and router 24. This is not the same as step g as claimed in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

JAMES HUANG

Date: May 11, 2005

By:



Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

MMB/BCM/dkp

Customer No. 28970